

[Roll No. 503]

## AYES—230

Aderholt Gillmor Parker  
 Archer Gilman Paul  
 Arney Goode Paxon  
 Bachus Goodlatte Pease  
 Baker Goodling Peterson (MN)  
 Ballenger Goss Peterson (PA)  
 Barcia Graham Petri  
 Barr Granger Pickering  
 Barrett (NE) Greenwood Pitts  
 Bartlett Gutknecht Pombo  
 Barton Hall (OH) Porter  
 Bass Hall (TX) Portman  
 Bateman Hansen Quinn  
 Bereuter Hastert Radanovich  
 Bilbray Hastings (WA) Ramstad  
 Billakis Hayworth Redmond  
 Blagojevich Hefley Regula  
 Bliley Herger Riggs  
 Blunt Hill Riley  
 Boehlert Hilleary Rogan  
 Boehner Hobson Rogers  
 Bonilla Hoekstra Rohrabacher  
 Bono Horn Ros-Lehtinen  
 Brady (TX) Hostettler Roukema  
 Bryant Houghton Royce  
 Bunning Hulshof Ryan  
 Burr Hunter Salmon  
 Burton Hutchinson Sanford  
 Callahan Hyde Saxton  
 Calvert Inglis Scarborough  
 Camp Istook Schaefer, Dan  
 Campbell Jenkins Schaffer, Bob  
 Canady Johnson (CT) Sensenbrenner  
 Cannon Jones Sessions  
 Castle Kasich Shadegg  
 Chabot Kelly Shaw  
 Chambliss Kildee Shays  
 Chenoweth Kim Shimkus  
 Christensen King (NY) Shuster  
 Coble Kingston Skeen  
 Coburn Klug Smith (MI)  
 Collins Knollenberg Smith (NJ)  
 Combest Kolbe Smith (OR)  
 Cook LaHood Smith (TX)  
 Cooksey Largent Smith, Linda  
 Cox Latham Snowbarger  
 Crane LaTourette Solomon  
 Crapo Lazio Souder  
 Cubin Leach Spence  
 Cunningham Lewis (CA) Stearns  
 Davis (VA) Lewis (KY) Stenholm  
 Deal Linder Stump  
 DeLay Livingston Sununu  
 Dickey LoBiondo Talent  
 Doolittle Lucas Tauzin  
 Dreier Manzullo Taylor (MS)  
 Duncan McCollum Taylor (NC)  
 Dunn McCrery Thomas  
 Ehlers McHugh Thornberry  
 Ehrlich McInnis Thune  
 Emerson McIntosh Tiahrt  
 English McKeon Upton  
 Ensign Metcalf Walsh  
 Everett Mica Wamp  
 Ewing Miller (FL) Watkins  
 Foley Moran (KS) Watts (OK)  
 Forbes Morella Weldon (FL)  
 Fossella Myrick Weldon (PA)  
 Fowler Nethercutt Weller  
 Fox Neumann White  
 Franks (NJ) Ney Whitfield  
 Frelinghuysen Northup Wicker  
 Gallegly Norwood Wilson  
 Ganske Nussle Wolf  
 Gekas Oxley Young (AK)  
 Gibbons Packard Young (FL)  
 Gilchrest Pappas

## NOES—192

Abercrombie Boyd  
 Ackerman Brady (PA) Cummings  
 Allen Brown (CA) Danner  
 Andrews Brown (FL) Davis (FL)  
 Baesler Brown (OH) Davis (IL)  
 Baldacci Capps DeFazio  
 Barrett (WI) Cardin DeGette  
 Becerra Carson Delahunt  
 Bentsen Clay DeLauro  
 Berman Clayton Deutsch  
 Berry Clement Dicks  
 Bishop Clyburn Dingell  
 Blumenauer Condit Dixon  
 Bonior Conyers Doggett  
 Borski Costello Doyle  
 Boswell Coyne Edwards  
 Boucher Cramer Engel  
 Eshoo

Etheridge Lowey  
 Evans Luther  
 Farr Maloney (CT)  
 Fattah Maloney (NY)  
 Filner Manton  
 Ford Markey  
 Frank (MA) Mascara  
 Frost Matsui  
 Furse McCarthy (MO)  
 Gejdenson McCarthy (NY)  
 Gephardt McDermott  
 Gonzalez McGovern  
 Gordon McHale  
 Green McIntyre  
 Gutierrez McKinney  
 Hamilton McNulty  
 Hastings (FL) Meehan  
 Hefner Meek (FL)  
 Hilliard Meeks (NY)  
 Hinchey Menendez  
 Hinojosa Millender-  
 Holden McDonald  
 Hooley Miller (CA)  
 Hoyer Minge  
 Jackson (IL) Mink  
 Jackson-Lee Moakley  
 (TX) Mollohan  
 Jefferson Moran (VA)  
 John Murtha  
 Johnson (WI) Nadler  
 Johnson, E. B. Neal  
 Kanjorski Oberstar  
 Kaptur Obey  
 Kennedy (MA) Oliver  
 Kennedy (RI) Ortiz  
 Kilpatrick Owens  
 Kind (WI) Pallone  
 Kleczka Pascrell  
 Klink Pastor  
 Kucinich Payne  
 LaFalce Pelosi  
 Lampson Pickett  
 Lantos Pomeroy  
 Lee Poshard  
 Levin Price (NC)  
 Lewis (GA) Rahall  
 Lipinski Rangel  
 Lofgren Reyes

## NOT VOTING—12

Buyer Fazio Martinez  
 Diaz-Balart Harman McDade  
 Dooley Johnson, Sam Pryce (OH)  
 Fawell Kennelly Yates

□ 1841

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

## FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2281) "An Act to amend title 17, United States Code, to implement the World Intellectual Property Organization Copyright Treaty and Performances and Phonograms Treaty, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3694) "An Act to authorize appro-

priations for fiscal year 1999 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4194) "An Act making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2206) "An Act to amend the Head Start Act, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981, and the Community Services Block Grant Act to reauthorize and make improvements to those Acts, to establish demonstration projects that provide an opportunity for persons with limited means to accumulate assets, and for other purposes."

## REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 4567

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on H.R. 4567, because of clerical error, the names of gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) be removed as cosponsors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

## LIMITATION OF TIME FOR DEBATE ON CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 4274, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of H.R. 4274 that debate time allotted to amendments numbered 2 and 3 in House Report 105-762, pursuant to H. Res. 584, be limited to 16 minutes each, equally divided.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. OBEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I just want to make certain that I understand what the last two words mean.

It is my understanding that if the time is equally divided, that means

that each party will have 8 minutes of time on each amendment.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. As I understand it, there are 2 amendments. Each amendment would be divided equally between the majority and the minority or in some such fashion according to the proponent and the opposition. The proponent would get 8 minutes, the opposition would get 8 minutes on each amendment; so, for a total of 16 minutes on each amendment.

Mr. OBEY. But the question, Mr. Speaker, is will the minority party have 8 minutes on each amendment? On each proposition, I mean.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman would continue to yield, I would suggest to the gentleman that the way that the amendment has been propounded that that would be up to the managers of the amendment and the manager in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I just need to have the assurance, and I want to cooperate on this, but I need to have the assurance that our side will be yielded 50 percent of the time on each of the two propositions.

□ 1845

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I understand that there is no certain way to guarantee that it is equally divided on each side of the aisle. However, I understand that there appears to be no opposition from the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), who would be one of the proponents of an amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving my right to object, that means that we would only have 4 minutes out of all of the debate time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I do not think that that is the case.

If the gentleman will yield further, would he tell me who would claim time in opposition to the Istook amendment?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving my right to object, as the gentleman knows, I am trying to get to a meeting to help facilitate the moving of the budget forward, so what I would like to do is have the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) on this side manage the time for the entire bill, including the two amendments.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, if the gentleman would advise us that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) would rise in opposition to the amendment, it would be the intention of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) to yield 8 minutes for the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) to control on the Istook amendment.

Mr. OBEY. We would also have 8 minutes on the Greenwood proposition.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman reserves the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The reservation is presently held by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) may yield on his reservation if he so chooses.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. We have two issues before us, one which the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) supports, one which many people oppose; and we have the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) which he supports, but many on our side oppose. If we divide the time as the gentleman has suggested, those equally opposing each amendment will not have equal share of the time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I do not want to do that.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to amend my unanimous consent request which apparently was unclear and unintentionally unclear.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, on each amendment, those in favor of the amendment be allotted 8 minutes, and those opposed be allotted 8 minutes and that, to as great a degree as possible, the time in each instance be shared on both sides.

It may well be that nobody on the gentleman's side of the aisle would like to claim time in one of those categories or another, but at least people will have the opportunity within that time frame to make their comments and be heard.

Mr. OBEY. Well, continuing under my reservation, Mr. Speaker, I am still trying to figure out what that means. We are not trying to hold anybody up. There are people on this side who want to speak as well. We just want to make certain that we will have an equal amount of time that will be yielded on both propositions. That is all.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we have two amendments. We have the Istook amendment, and we have the Greenwood amendment. According to my unanimous consent request, I have asked that, on each, there be 8 minutes allotted for and 8 minutes allotted against.

I guess it would be a little bit simpler if we simply decided right now within the context of this unanimous consent who will represent those for and who will represent those against on each amendment.

In the instance of the Greenwood amendment, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) would have the time for 8 minutes. I am asking the gentleman's statements, I assume that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) could be recognized in opposition to the Greenwood amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, continuing under my reservation, let me explain to the gentleman, I am sure that, on our side of the aisle, the preponderance of the speakers will be against the Istook amendment. I do not want us to have all the time against the Istook amendment.

I think that, if there are 8 minutes against the Istook amendment, 4 ought to be reserved for the majority party if they want them. If they do not want them, I do not think we ought to have them anyway.

But we would like at least 4 minutes on the Istook amendment and 4 minutes on the Greenwood amendment. If the gentleman do that, I do not care how he works out the time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. OBEY. Absolutely. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like my unanimous consent request to be amended so that, on the Greenwood amendment, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) be allotted 8 minutes to be divided as he sees fit.

Mr. OBEY. That is fine so far.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That 8 minutes be allotted to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) to be divided as he sees fit.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Wisconsin will yield, which I would be happy to share with those who feel that position from your side of the aisle.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, so what the gentleman is saying, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will have 8 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) will have 8 minutes, and he has agreed to yield 4 of it to us.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is on Greenwood.

Mr. OBEY. On Greenwood.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will further yield, on Istook, that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) will be allotted 8 minutes to be divided as he sees fit, and that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) will be allotted 8 minutes in opposition to be divided as he sees fit.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving my right to object, we would agree that the time of gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) would be split evenly between the parties if there are persons on the gentleman's side who want to argue against that amendment.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Correct.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, with that understanding, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request by the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR,  
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,  
AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED  
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS  
ACT, 1999

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 564 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4274.

□ 1952

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4274) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, with Mr. BEREUTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 564, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Pursuant to House Resolution 584, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, today we take a vote on the future of our children. Day in and day out the Members of the 105th Congress come to the floor and express their concerns for ensuring opportunities for the next generation. H.R. 4274, "the Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations bill," is one piece of legislation that goes to the heart of our collective concerns. However, despite our desire to assist our children we instead embark on a bill that politicizes their future. Instead of providing opportunities, this bill guts national education funding for short term political gain. This bill eliminates funding for technology in the classroom in low-income school districts, it eliminates funding for teacher training, and it even eliminates funding to ensure that our children can read before the end of the third grade.

However, to just discuss the inadequacies of this bill on our elementary school aged children would not be a fair summarization of the destructive nature of this piece of legislation. This appropriations bill attempts at its very essence, to provide budget cuts off the backs of the poor, the immigrant and the laborer. H.R. 4274 if passed would eliminate federal subsidized funding for 4.4 million of the poorest households to pay for their heat during the winter months; this bill if passed would cut federal funding for bilingual education by \$25 million which would reduce funding for adequate teacher training; this bill if passed would even cut OSHA workplace safety enforcement by \$12 million which would result in 4,000 fewer workplace safety inspections in 1999.

The role of government is debated each day on the floor of this House, in our committee rooms, and in our districts but we all can agree that our mandate is to serve the people.

It is paramount that as a national body we focus not on partisan political goals but rather on what is in the best interest of our constituents. Members would then understand that this appropriation bill is too unfair, too detrimental to our national educational policy and too damaging to the poor. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in opposing H.R. 4274 and vote no on this bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, Mr. GREENWOOD's amendment protects a good program, a program that Members should support.

One of our priorities in this bill is public health programs that help expand access to care for the underserved. Title X—as George Bush and Richard Nixon recognized—is such a program.

1. It supports a broad range of reproductive services to women—including assistance for women who are having trouble conceiving children—as well as screening for breast and cervical cancer, sexually transmitted infections and hypertension. These are life saving, life giving, life enhancing services.

2. In 1996, 4.3 million clients were served—83 percent with incomes below 150 percent of the federal poverty level. Everyone above the poverty line pays something for their care on a sliding scale. For many working poor, Title X provides their only access to the health care system.

3. The law has always barred Title X from paying for any abortion under any circumstances. This is not an abortion issue.

Title X is really an anti-abortion program: roughly half of all unintended pregnancies end in abortion. It is estimated that, in 1994, one million unintended pregnancies were averted as a result of services received at Title X projects. Title X prevents the unintended pregnancies that lead to abortions and that lead to low-birthweight babies.

Title X improves maternal and child health, it lowers the incidence of unintended pregnancy and abortion and it lowers rates of STDs.

It is a good program, it is a wise investment, and we should be very careful about adopting amendments that undermine the program's effectiveness.

I urge all Members to support Mr. GREENWOOD's amendment and oppose Mr. ISTOOK's substitute.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations (Labor—HHS) Bill considered in the House today.

EDUCATION SUFFERS UNDER THIS BILL

This bill would have devastating effects on students and our education system and I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been busy with their education agenda this year. We've debated a Constitutional Amendment to allow for prayer in schools and we've tried to eliminate affirmative action programs for minority students. We've also tried to provide public dollars for private schools—not once, but twice, and to eliminate public dollars to be used for the purposes of educating our bilingual students. Lucky for our students, parents and teachers, Democrats have an education agenda, too.

The Democratic plan will improve public education. We want to reduce the average class size in the early grades by helping local school districts hire 100,000 new qualified teachers. We want to provide federal tax cred-

its to pay the interest on \$22 billion in bonds for the modernization and construction of more than 5,000 schools. We want to make sure that schoolchildren have somewhere to go after school instead of hanging out on the streets. We are promoting after school learning opportunities for students. We support expanding resources for educational technology in order to ensure that every classroom and school library is connected to the Internet by 2001.

The Democratic ideas will work; they will provide more opportunities for out kids. Nobody denies that public education is in bad shape. But the majority's solution is to cut funding and eliminate programs and to determine what choices are made available to school districts and teachers. This does not make good sense or good policy.

This Education Appropriations bill fails to fund a single one of the Administration's initiatives to modernize schools and build new schools. It is no secret that schools are overcrowded. Schoolteachers in my district are conducting classes in portables, school lunchrooms and even in hallways. The majority, by not addressing this problem in their bill, are putting a bag over their head and hoping the problem goes away.

This Education Appropriations bill does not fund the President's Literacy Initiatives and eliminates funding for the America Reads Challenge. Furthermore, the bill cuts funding for the Safe and Drug Free Schools initiative, and does not fund the President's plan to target funds to districts and schools with the largest drug and violence programs.

This bill also incorporates the text of a bill that was defeated by the House earlier this year and with regard to bilingual education. This bill would limit the amount of bilingual education a student could receive to a maximum of two years. Reputable research proves that children take between four to seven years to master academic English necessary for higher education success. This bill provides no academic safety net for students who fail to master English in two years. It does not make sense to shove children arbitrarily from an environment where they are learning to one where they are predetermined to fail.

The House has already soundly defeated this idea. Why does this bill pander to an extreme minority who has already lost this fight?

This bill also prevents students from achieving success in the new millennium by cutting funds for GOALS 2000 by 50%. How does cutting funding for this program help students? I would ask the majority leadership to answer this question.

This bill also prevents any funds from being spent to adopt a national testing standard for our kids. These tests have nothing to do with content and would test fourth graders for reading comprehensive and eighth graders for math ability. I support national testing standards. These voluntary tests will have no effect on home schooling or parochial education interests. Testing gives states, local communities and parents one more tool to measure how well their curriculum prepares students in basic reading and math skills. If we are to spend taxpayer money on public schools, we must know that we are getting measurable results.

It is clear that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not think the same way about education as we do. Their attacks on our basic fundamental obligation to provide a